

**THE REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-22, 24 and 28-30 are pending in the application. Claims 4-5, 16-17, 23 and 25-27 are cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 30 are amended herein.

**The Amendments**

Claim 1, directed to a data structure, has been amended to clarify that both the first pointer (pointing to a sequence of commands stored in a first memory area) and the second pointer (pointing to a burst of data or mask items stored in a second memory area distinct from the first) are entered into the same data structure. These amendments are set forth in the first and second paragraphs of the body of claim 1 as follows:

“a first pointer, entered in the data structure, to a sequence of ~~one or more~~ commands, executable by a processor, implementing one or more packet modification operations and stored, in packed format, with more than one command stored in a single addressable entry of the stored sequence, in a first memory area; and

a second pointer, also entered in the data structure, to a burst of ~~one or more~~ data or mask items, stored, in packed format, with more than one data or mask item stored in a single addressable entry of the stored burst, in a second memory area distinct from the first, for use by the processor in executing the one or more commands;”

These amendments are supported, for example, by Fig. 20, reproduced below, showing an example of the claimed data structure:

10.4.1.2. Internal Link Entry Format

Bit	Function	Description
20-0	BURST ADDR 1	Burst Address 1.
24-21	BURST LEN 1	Burst Length 1.
46-35	BURST ADDR 2	Burst Address 2.
51-47	BURST LEN 2	Burst Length 2.
62-52	INT RFX IPR INDEX	Internal Recipe Index.
63-62	INT RFX IPR LEN	Internal Recipe Length.
69A-68	-	Reserved.
70	INTERNAL	Internal/External.
71	PAR	Parity bit. Set so that there is odd parity across bits 71:0 of the entry data.

FIGURE 20

As can be seen, this example of the claimed data structure includes a pointer to a sequence of commands (the Internal Recipe Index, contained in bits 52-62), and a pointer to a burst of data or mask items (either the Burst Address 1, contained in bit 0-20, or the Burst Address 2, contained in bits 26-46).

The claim has further been amended to require that the commands in the sequence pointed to by the first pointer be stored in packed format, where more than one command is stored in a single addressable entry in the stored sequence, and that the data or mask items in the burst be stored in packed format, where more than one data or mask item is stored in a single addressable entry in the burst.

These amendments are supported, for example, by Fig. 22, reproduced below, showing more than one command in the sequence being stored in a single addressable entry of the stored sequence:

Internal Recipe RAM Data Format				
[71]	[70]	[69:36]	[35:24]	[23:0]
Parity	Command (n+1) valid	Command (n+1)	Reserved	Command (n)

FIGURE 22

It is also supported by Fig. 21B, reproduced below, showing more than one data or mask items in the burst being stored in a single addressable entry in the stored burst:

FIG. 21A Data Entry Format

Bit	Function	Description
31-0	DATA 0	Data Segment 0.
25-32	DATA LEN	Data Length.
67-46	DATA 1	Data Segment 1.
70-68	-	Reserved.
71	P2.R	Parity bit. Set so that there is odd parity across bits 71:0 of the parity data.

FIGURE 21A

Further support for these amendments is provided, for example, by page 31, lines 4-12, page 31, line 26, to page 32, line 2, page 31, lines 15-25.

Claim 1 has further been amended to clarify that the commands in the sequence specify performing one or more packet modification operations using, as operands or masks of operands, the data or mask items in the burst:

“wherein at least one the commands in the sequence implements a packet modification operation that uses specify performing the one or more packet modification operations using, as operands or as masks for operands, at least one of the one or more the data or mask items in the burst to modify a packet”

This amendment is supported by Fig. 25, and related text at page 33, line 11, to page 37, line 9, illustrating and describing several examples of the commands, which utilize the data or mask items as operands or masks of operands:

[illegible]

FIGURE 25

Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 11 and 24.

The amendments to dependent claims 6, 9, 10, 18, 21, 22 and 30 are necessitated by the amendments to the independent claims.

As can be seen from the foregoing, none of the amendments introduce new matter.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

*Independent claims 1, 11 and 24*

Independent claims 1, 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Okagawa, *et al.*, US Pat. Pub. No. 2007/0291754 (hereinafter “Okagawa”) in view of Hung, *et al.* US Pat. No. 6,530,010 (hereinafter “Hung”).

However, as amended, independent claims 1, 11 and 24 are patentable over Okagawa and Hung, considered singly or in combination. Five arguments support this.

First, Okagawa and Hung are not in analogous fields, and address different problems. Okagawa relates to the field of packet communication systems and a transfer device (e.g., router) for use therein. (See Okagawa, par. [0001]). It concerns the lack of flexibility of conventional routers to respond to changes in the network control functions to be performed by such routers. (*Id.* at par. [0024]). In contrast to this, Hung relates to the field of signal processing, and, more specifically, to Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD) coprocessor architectures providing for faster image and video processing. (See Hung, Col. 1, lines 10-14). It concerns the inability to efficiently handle two-dimensional (2D) filtering operations using architectures configured with one-dimensional (1D) filtering operations in mind. (*Id.* at Col. 1, lines 16-40). On this basis alone, Hung is not combinable with Okagawa. (See MPEP §2141.01(a)(I)).

Second, there would have been no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art, seeking to address the problem of lack of flexibility of conventional routers described in Okagawa to look to the teachings of Hung to address this problem. The Office Action claims that one of ordinary skill in the art, concerned as taught in Okagawa with sending packets of instructions to multiple routers in a packet communication system, would have been motivated to look to the teachings of Hung to represent these packets with pointers in order to reduce the number of copies of the packets that need to be transmitted, (*see* paragraph bridging pages 4-5 of the Office Action), but this is incorrect as the instructions themselves (not a pointer to these instructions) would need to be transmitted to each the routers in Okagawa in order to change their functionality by modifying a function mapping table (shown in Fig. 5) maintained on the router, as taught by Okagawa. (See Okagawa, par. [0079] (“The function-mapping control unit 52 is a manager configured to update the function-mapping table 53 (first memory) in accordance with the instruction information received from the network manager 30.”) (emphasis added)). In other words, it would not suffice to simply transmit a pointer to such instructions to the router. Therefore, there would have been no motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to look to the teachings of Hung to represent these packets with pointers. This lack of motivation weighs against the ability to combine Okagawa with Hung to support an obviousness rejection.

Third, even assuming *arguendo* it is permissible to combine Okagawa with Hung (it isn’t, but assuming for the sake of argument it is), any such combination would not meet the limitations of the claims as amended. For example, nowhere do the combined teachings of

Okagawa and Hung teach or suggest the claimed data structure that comprises a first pointer, entered in the data structure, that points to a sequence of commands in a first memory area stored in packed format, with more than one command stored in a single addressable entry in the stored sequence, and a second pointer, also entered in the same data structure, that points to a burst of data or mask items in a second memory area distinct from the first stored in packed format, with more than one data or mask item stored in a single addressable entry in the stored burst, where the commands specify one or more packet modification operations using the data or mask items as operands or masks of operands in the one or more packet modification operations. These requirements are set forth in the following paragraphs of the body of claim 1 as amended, and similar amendments are recited in independent claims 11 and 24:

“a first pointer, entered in the data structure, to a sequence of ~~one or more~~ commands, executable by a processor, implementing one or more packet modification operations and stored, in packed format, with more than one command stored in a single addressable entry of the stored sequence, in a first memory area; and

a second pointer, also entered in the data structure, to a burst of ~~one or more~~ data or mask items, stored, in packed format, with more than one data or mask item stored in a single addressable entry of the stored burst, in a second memory area distinct from the first, for use by the processor in executing the one or more commands;

wherein ~~at least one~~ the commands in the sequence ~~implements a packet modification operation that uses~~ specify performing the one or more packet modification operations using, as operands or as masks for operands, at least one of the one or more the data or mask items ~~in the burst to modify a packet.~~”

Simply representing the packet of instructions referenced in par. [0056] of Okagawa with a pointer would not achieve this data structure as the Office Action seems to assume. As mentioned, the claim requires that there be at least two pointers entered in the same data structure, the first to a sequence of commands, and the second to a burst of data or mask items, where the commands in the sequence specify one or more packet modification operations that

use, as operands or mask of operands, the data or mask items in the burst. Nothing in the combined teachings of Okagawa and Hung teach or suggest a data structure with both these pointers.

Moreover, nothing in Okagawa or Hung teaches or suggests pointers that point to commands (or operands or operand masks) stored in packed format with more than one command (or operand or mask of operand) stored in a single addressable entry of a stored sequence or burst. The Office Action claims that Fig. 5 of Okagawa illustrates this feature, (*see* Office Action, page 10), but it does not. Instead, Fig. 5 of Okagawa, reproduced below, and related text (e.g., par. [0085]) merely indicate that various IDs and information elements are stored in the same table (*i.e.*, function-mapping table and/or function-mapping cache table). But nothing in this figure or related text teaches or suggests storing more than one command (or operand or operand mask) in a single addressable entry of a stored sequence or burst, which is the requirement stated in the claims as amended.

**FIG. 5**

53 FUNCTION-MAPPING TABLE  
(51E FUNCTION-MAPPING CACHE TABLE)

TERMINAL ID	FUNCTION ID	ROUTING ID	VARIOUS INFORMATION ELEMENT
#A (DESTINATION)	#1	#1	DISCARD THE PACKET INCLUDING THE SOURCE ADDRESS #H
#B (DESTINATION)	#3 #Z	#3 #Z	*GENERATE THREE COPIES *CHANGE THE ROUTING ADDRESS
#C (DESTINATION)	#Z	#Z	*CHANGE THE ROUTING ADDRESS

Fourth, Fig. 5 and related text (par. [0085]) of Okagawa teaches or suggests storing the various IDs and information elements in the same area of memory.

[0085] The function-mapping table 53, which is connected to the function-mapping control unit 52 and the packet

| switch 56, is a first memory configured to store a packet ID |  
| (terminal ID) associated with a function unit 57, to 57, of the |  
| control function executed on the packet (function ID) and a |  
| parameter required to execute the control function (various |  
| information element). As shown in FIG. 5, the configuration |  
| of the function-mapping table 53 is same as the configura- |  
tion of the function-mapping cache table 51.

Thus, Okagawa, which is the base reference, teaches against the requirement of the claims that the sequence of commands be stored in a first memory area, and the burst of data or mask items be stored in a second memory area distinct from the first. On this basis as well, the obviousness rejection of Okagawa in view of Hung must fail. (*See* MPEP §2144.05(III) (“A *prima facie* case of obviousness may also be rebutted by showing that the art, in any material respect, teaches away from the claimed invention.”)).

Fifth, since the principle of operation of Okagawa, which is the base reference, is to store the various IDs and information elements in the same table and, therefore, area of memory, nothing in Hung or any of the secondary references can be relied on to support deviating from this principle of operation. (*See* MPEP 2143.01(VI) (“If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.”)). For this additional reason, the obviousness rejection based on Okagawa in view of Hung must fail.

For all the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 11 and 24 are allowable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 2-3, 6-10, 12-15, 18-22, 28-30

Dependent claims 2-3, 6-10, 12-15, 18-22 and 28-30 are dependent, directly or indirectly, on independent claims 1, 11 and 24. Since claims 1, 11 and 24 are patentable over the cited art, for the reasons discussed, *supra*, then dependent claims 2-3, 6-10, 12-15, 18-22 and 28-30 are allowable over the cited art as well, due to their dependence on an allowable base claim.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are allowable and on that basis earnestly solicits the Examiner to allow all claims and pass this application to issuance. If any issues or questions remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (940) 759-5269.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2009

/Robert C. Laurenson/  
Robert C. Laurenson (Reg. No. 34,206)

HOWREY LLP  
2941 Fairview Park Drive, Box 7  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
Tel: 949.721.5269  
Fax: 949.721.6910